TRIBUNE TRACTS.—No. 2.

Democratic Leaders for Disunion.

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY WILSON,

OF MASSACHUSETTS,

DELIVERED IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, JAN. 25, 1860.

THE Senate proceeded to consider the following resolutions, submitted by Mr. BROWN on the 18th instant:

Resolved, That the Territories are the common property of all the States, and that it is the privilege of the citizens of all the States to go into the Territories with every kind or description of property recognized by the Constitution of the United States, and held under the laws of any of the States; and that it is the constitutional duty of the law-making power, wherever lodged or by whomsoever exercised, whether by the Congress or Territorial Legislature, to enact such laws as may be found necessary for the adequate and sufficient protection of such property.

Resolved, That the Committee on Territories be instructed to insert, in any bill they may report for the organization of new Territories, a clause declaring it to be the duty of the Territorial Legislature to enact adequate and sufficient laws for the protection of all kinds of property, as above described, within the limits of the Territory; and that, upon its failure or refusal to do so, it is the admitted duty of Congress to interfere and pass such laws.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, when the Republic entered the family of nations, it proclaimed to kings and princes, to nobles and privileged classes, to toiling freemen and lowly bondmen, the equality of man. Passing now through the eighty-fourth year of national life, America presents to the gaze of nations the humiliating and saddening spectacle of a Republic which began its independent existence by the promulgation of a bill of rights as old as creation and as wide as humanity, distracted by discordant and angry discussions upon issues growing out of the bondage of four million men.

Slavery in America—our connections with it, and relations to it, the obligations these connections and relations impose upon us as men, as citizens of the States and of the United States—make the issues of the age, the transcendent magnitude of which command the profoundest attention of the country. In the crowded city and the lonely dwelling, the public press and the judicial tribunal, the hall of legislation and the temple of the living God—everywhere—goes on the "irrepressible conflict" between the sublime creed of the charter of independence and the aggressive spirit of slavery; between the institutions of freedom our fathers founded and the system of human bondage which now darkens the land, casting its baleful shadows over the Republic, obscuring its lustre and marring its symmetry and beauty.

Within fifteen States of this Democratic Republic, which commenced its career by uttering the ideas of equality and liberty that live in the throbbing hearts of the toiling masses, and nurse even the wavering hopes of hapless bondmen amid the thick gloom of rayless oppression, more than four million human beings, made in the image of God, are held in perpetual bondage. By inexorable laws, sanctioned by the merciless force of public opinion, these millions are denied the rights of manhood, and degraded to the abject condition of chattelhood. To them, the hallowed relations of husband and wife, parent and child, are held not by the sacred rights of a common humanity, but by the will of masters. The laws, the

☞ FOR SALE AT THE OFFICE OF THE NEW YORK TRIBUNE. PRICE, PER SINGLE COPY, 4c. DOZEN COPIES, 25c.; PER HUNDRED, $1 25; PER THOUSAND, $10.

THE BUFFALO HISTORY MUSEUM

customs, the public opinion, which have sunk these millions from the dignity of humanity down to the degradation of chattels, have founded and developed a privileged class, which now controls the slave-holding States. This class now rules these fifteen States, abrogating, in support of its interests, the inborn, inbred, constitutional right of freedom of speech and freedom of the press. In these States, the power of this class is overshadowing, resistless, complete.

Over the Federal Government this class, this slave power, has achieved complete dominion. The slave power this day holds the National Government, in all its departments, in absolute subjugation. In this Chamber, where sit the representatives of sovereign Commonwealths, that power retains unbroken sway. That power bids the Supreme Court utter its decrees, and that high tribunal obeys its imperative commands. That power holds the President in the hollow of its hand, compelling him to declare that "slavery exists in Kansas by virtue of the Constitution;" that "the master has the right to take his slave into the Territories as property, and have it protected there under the Federal Constitution;" that "neither Congress nor the Territorial Legislature, nor any human power, has any authority to annul or impair this vested right." That power summoned the aspiring Vice-President to his own Kentucky, to give his assurances "that this constitutional right exists;" that "we must hold to this principle, we must stand by it;" and "if it cannot be enforced for want of proper legislation to enforce it, sufficient legislation must be passed, or our Government is a failure." That power lays its iron hand upon the representatives of free and proud Commonwealths, in this Chamber and in the other, compelling them to disavow their own recorded opinions, to accept the monstrous dogma, that "neither Congress, nor a Territorial Legislature, nor any human power, has any authority to annul or impair the vested right" of the master to have his slave protected as property in the Territories under the Federal Constitution. Well might the Vice-President, in view of the recent triumphs and the imperial sway of the slave power, proudly say to the men of his native Kentucky, "We stand in a good position!" "We have the Executive; we have the laws; we have the courts; and that is a great advance from where we stood ten years ago!"

The glowing pages of that history which records the deeds of the heroic men who, in defence of the inherent and indefeasible rights of humanity, accepted the bloody issues of civil war, and defied and baffled the gigantic power of the British Empire, won national independence, and framed a Constitution for united America, bear to us of this generation the amplest evidences that they, with rare exceptions, believed slavery to be a local and temporary evil, which British avarice planted and British power nurtured in America, and which the advancing current of a humane and Christian civilization would sweep from the land it stained and polluted. But seventy years, Mr. President, have now passed away since the inauguration of the Government under the Federal Constitution. That six hundred thousand bondmen, valued at less than fifty million dollars, have increased to four million, valued at more than two thousand million. That feeble system of African slavery, which seemed to the hopeful eyes of our patriotic fathers smitten with the disease of original sin, has expanded into a gigantic system, which now casts its chilling influences over the land, polluting the very sources of national life, perverting the moral sense of the nation, corrupting the sentiment of justice, humanity, and liberty, and leaving the traces of its ruinous power upon the institutions and upon the soil of the Republic, which it turns to barrenness and desolation.

Sir, this expansion and growth of the system of African slavery, this development of the slave power, during the past seventy years, have wrought a wonderful change, a complete revolution, in the sentiments and opinions of the public men who control the councils of America. What a contrast between slavery in America in 1789, and slavery in America in 1860! Then, it was weak; now, it is strong. Then, its influences over the nation were impotent; now, it holds the Government in its iron grasp. Then, the public men who dictated the policy of the Government deemed it to be a moral, social, and political evil, which humanity and religion deplored; now, it is regarded by the men who control the Government as a positive good, a beneficent system, "a great moral," in the words of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BROWN], "social and political blessing—a blessing to the master and a blessing to the slave." Then, to prohibit it in the Territories was deemed alike the right and duty of the Government; now, the avowed doctrine of the Administration of the Government is, that the slaveholders have the right to carry their slaves as property into the Territories, and hold them there as property by virtue of the Constitution, and that "neither Congress nor a Territorial Legislature, nor any human power, has authority to annul or impair this vested right." Then, to cherish, as a living faith, the creed "that all men are created equal;" to believe slavery to be an evil; to believe, with Henry, that "a time would come to abolish this lamentable evil;" and with Jefferson, that "nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate, than that this people shall be free," brought neither proscription from power, nor indignities from the people; now, these sentiments bring upon the public man the proscriptions of power, the ridicule and reproach of presses in the interest of power, and subject the American citizen, whose rights are guarded by constitutional guaranties, in the slave States to the insults and degrading indignities of lawless and brutal mobs, maddened by the fanaticism of slavery, to arrests, imprisonments, fines, and banishments. Then, the people of America confided their new Government to the guardianship and guidance of statesmen, known by their acts and recorded opinions to be unalterably opposed to the slave trade, to the perpetuity of slavery, to its expansion into the vast empire of the Northwest; now, the public men of America, who inherit the sentiments and opinions of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Adams, Jay, Hamilton, and their illustrious compeers, who would consecrate the territorial possessions of the Republic to

THE BUFFALO HISTORY MUSEUM

free institutions for all, are admonished, in these chambers, that they will not be permitted, in the slave States, to avow their sentiments, or to advocate the election to the Presidency, in 1860, of a candidate representing their policy; ay, that the election of such a candidate will be the cause for the dissolution of the Union.

In the month of August, 1620, twenty African bondmen were borne into the waters of Virginia. At Jamestown, in 1620, began that system of human slavery in America, which now, in 1860, haughtily assumes to mold and fashion the policy of the nation; to expand itself over the vast possessions of the Republic; to repress the inborn right of the freedom of speech and of the press; to arrest and to imprison, to scourge and to banish American citizens for entertaining, cherishing, and uttering the sentiments of the great statesmen of the North and of the South, who carried us through the fire and blood of the Revolution—statesmen whose names are forever associated with national independence and constitutional freedom.

This system of African slavery, planted on the shores of Virginia, grew and spread over America under the colonial and commercial policy of England. Encouraged by British legislation, and fostered by royal favor, the merchants of England transported from the shores of western Africa, to the thirteen British colonies, from the middle of the seventeenth century to 1776, more than three hundred thousand of the children of Africa. The coffers of her merchants were filled with gold, soiled with the blood of these hapless bondmen. For nearly two centuries the party of the slave trade controlled the Government, and directed the policy of England. Kings and queens, lords and commons, judges and attorneys general, and bishops, all gave to the traffic in the bodies of men their persistent support. Parliament pronounced "the trade highly advantageous to the kingdom and its colonies." Queen Anne instructed the Governor of New York and New Jersey "to give due encouragement to the Royal African Company." The merchants and manufacturers clamored for the extension and protection of the African slave traffic; and when the charter of the Royal African Company expired, in 1749, the ports of Africa, for thirty degrees, from Cape Blanco to Loango St. Paul's, were thrown upon to the free competition of British commerce. Under this colonial and commercial policy of England, the traffic in the bodies of men, between the coasts of Africa and the Spanish, French and British colonies in the western world, expanded into gigantic proportions, and slavery spread and increased with such fearful rapidity, that the American colonies were startled and appalled; and "laws designed to restrict importations of slaves," says Bancroft, "are scattered along the records of colonial legislation." To check their importation, Virginia imposed a tax; but "the African Company obtained the repeal of the law." "The British Government," says Madison, "constantly checked the attempts of Virginia to put a stop to this *infernal traffic*." Oglethorpe, the founder of Georgia, forbade slavery; but "the merchants got the Government to sanction slavery there." Even South Carolina, for attempting to restrict the slave traffic, received the rebuke of the British Government, which steadily and relentlessly resisted all colonial action tending to check the inhuman traffic in the souls and bodies of men. Up to the hour of national independence, the Government of England sternly rejected all colonial restrictions upon slavery and the slave trade, and persisted in the policy of forcing that trade upon all her colonies, which were "not allowed," in the words of the Earl of Dartmouth, 1775. "to checke or discourage, in any degree, a traffic so beneficial to the nation." British avarice planted slavery in America; British legislation nurtured and sustained it; and British statesmen sanctioned and guarded it.

In spite, however, of the avarice of the men who guided the commercial and colonial policy of England, spite of the potent influences of the statesmen who swayed the councils of the Throne, the slave trade and slavery found sturdy opponents in England and America. In the middle of the eighteenth century, years before Granville Sharpe brought James Somerset before the King's Bench—twenty years before Lord Mansfield pronounced that immortal opinion, which reversed the joint opinion of York and Talbot, that "a slave coming into Great Britain doth not become free," and made it forever impossible for slaves to breathe the air of England—John Woolman traversed America, proclaiming to Christian men that "the practice of continuing men in slavery was not right;" that "liberty was the natural right of all men equally." This early apostle of emancipation found many slave masters on the banks of the Hudson, the Delaware, and the Potomac, who encouraged the emancipation of the bondmen, "because they had no contract for their labor, and liberty was their right." During the years of agitation and discussion, from the treaty of Paris in 1762 to the opening dawn of the Revolution at Lexington—years, during which the rights of the colonies and the rights of man were discussed with masterly power by the most gifted minds of America, the popular leaders in New England, the middle colonies, and Virginia, did not fail to see and to acknowledge the wrongfulness of slavery, and to denounce the slave traffic and the slavery-extending policy of the British Government. The records of those days of trial and of glory will bear to all coming time the amplest evidence that the men who inaugurated the Revolution, carried America from colonial dependence to national independence, were not only hostile to the slave trade, but to the perpetual existence of slavery itself.

When the first congress assembled, in 1774, the humanity of the colonies, long repressed and baffled by the power of England, found utterance. That assemblage of illustrious men declared that "God never intended a part of the human race to hold property in, and unbounded power over, others;" that they "would not import slaves, or buy slaves imported by others." These illustrious statesmen framed the articles of association which united the colonies in one federative Union. By the second article of that bond of union, the slave trade was

THE BUFFALO HISTORY MUSEUM

prohibited; and that prohibition of the inhuman traffic in man was sustained by the men of the North and the men of the South, and by the colonies of the North and of the South. Thus did the slave trade, which Jefferson afterward, in the original draft of the Declaration, branded as an "execrable commerce," a "piratical warfare," receive the condemnation of the men who accepted the bloody issues of civil war in defence of their perilled liberties.

When the Declaration of Independence was proclaimed, nearly half a million of men were held in bondage in America. Influenced by the rising spirit of liberty, by the awakened sense of the natural rights of man, which had found utterance in the charter of independence, the northern States early adopted measures tending to emancipation. Nor were efforts for the emancipation of the bondmen confined to the northern States. Jefferson and Wythe, commissioned to revise the laws of Virginia, after the peace of 1783, prepared a plan of gradual emancipation; but timid counsels prevailed, and the Old Dominion failed to take her place in the list of free Commonwealths. Timidity, the sordid spirit of gain, the lust and pride of the privileged class—not the humane sentiments of Washington and Henry, Jefferson and Wythe, Mason and Randolph—controlled the policy of that great State. But Mr. Jefferson, in a letter to Dr. Price, of England, in 1785, thus spoke of the cause of emancipation in Virginia:

"This is the next state to which we may turn our eyes for the interesting spectacle of *justice in conflict with avarice and oppression*—a conflict wherein the sacred side is daily gaining recruits, from the influx into office of young men grown up and growing up. These have sucked in the principles of liberty, as it were, with their mothers' milk; and it is to them I look with anxiety to turn the fate of the question."

When the Convention assembled in May, 1787, to frame the Constitution of the United States, Massachusetts was a free Commonwealth. The foot of the slave no longer pressed the rock of Plymouth, nor the hallowed sods of Lexington, Concord or Bunker Hill. Other northern States had taken measures for ultimate emancipation; but slavery, in its modified form, still lingered in the North. In the whole country, nearly six hundred thousand human beings were held in servitude; but these bondmen were only estimated at the average value of eighty dollars each; and Elbridge Gerry estimated the whole value of the slaves at that time, south of the Potomac, at $10,000.000. Slavery existed in each of the States by the mere force of the laws, usages, and regulations, of the people of each State where it was recognized as a mere local institution.

In that assemblage of illustrious statesmen, met to frame a Constitution for a free people, were men whose wisdom in council and valor in the field had carried the country through the fire of a revolutionary war. The baptism of freedom was on their brows, and its spirit burned in their bosoms. Over that assemblage of statesmen presided the peerless Washington, who "wished as much as any man living to see slavery abolished by legislative authority;" and to "accomplish it by the only proper and effective mode," his "suffrage should never be wanting." Franklin regarded slavery as an "atrocious debasement of human nature," and he was prepared to "step to the verge of vested power to discourage every species of traffic in the bodies of our fellowmen." Madison, whose name is forever associated with the Constitution of the United States, pronounced slavery "a dreadful calamity," and he "thought it wrong to admit in the Constitution the idea that there could be property in man." Gouverneur Morris, whose hand was to give the finishing form to the work of the Convention, denounced slavery as "a nefarious institution." Luther Martin believed that "God was Lord of all, viewing with equal eye the poor African slave and his American master;" and he would "authorize the General Government to make such regulations as should be most advantageous for the gradual abolition of slavery and the emancipation of the slaves which were already in the States." Elbridge Gerry "would leave slavery to be dealt with by the States, but he would give no sanction to it." Oliver Ellsworth believed "slavery would soon be only a speck in the country." George Mason declared that slavery produced "the most pernicious effects on manners;" that "every master of slaves is born a petty tyrant;" that "it brought the curse of Heaven on a country." Roger Sherman "would not tax slaves, because it would imply that they were property." Rufus King would by organic law enact that "slavery shall be forever prohibited" in the western Territories. Alexander Hamilton, James Wilson, Robert Morris, and other statesmen, whose names are imperishably associated with the constitutional history of the Republic, have left in the records of the country their sentiments of hostility to slavery. The framers of the Constitution, like the members of the first Congress, who branded the slave trade; the members of the Congress of 1776, who declared that "all men are created equal;" and the members of the Congress of 1787, who stamped the words "slavery shall be and is forever prohibited" on every foot of the territory northwest of the Ohio, were hostile to the traffic in men, to the extension of slavery, and to its perpetuity in America.

But there came into that Convention the representatives of a small but powerful class, which clung, in South Carolina and Georgia, with relentless tenacity to the British slave-trading and slave-extending and slave-perpetuating policy. In "complaisance to this class in South Carolina and Georgia," the signers of the Declaration of Independence had erased from the original draft of Jefferson the arraignment of the British monarch for "waging cruel war against human nature itself," "violating its most sacred rights of life and liberty in the persons of a distant people, who never offended him, captivating and carrying them into slavery in another hemisphere." This class had broken the second article of the association of union, which prohibited the importation and the traffic in slaves; and in that time of trial and of anxiety, when the men who had met undismayed the power of England on the perilous ridges of battle, trembled for the future of their country, the representatives of this slaveholding class of the

THE BUFFALO HISTORY MUSEUM

extreme South came into that council of patriotic statesmen, ready to peril the unity of the Republic, unless they could wring from the Convention the power to continue the inhuman, loathsome, and polluted traffic in the muscles and bones of men—a traffic which Jefferson branded as an "execrable commerce," and Madison pronounced "infernal." To silence the clamorous demands of the Rutledges and Pinckneys, the Butlers and Baldwins—the representatives of this class—the Convention made a compromise, by which they permitted the slave trade to continue for twenty years longer, unchecked by national legislation, three-fifths of the slaves to be represented in the House, and a provision to be incorporated into the Constitution for the rendition of persons owing service or labor in one State escaping into another. These concessions were wrung from the Convention, not by the power of the slaveholding class, but by its weakness, rather—by the fatal confidence of the statesmen of that day, that slavery would soon pass away under the influence of the ideas they had proclaimed and the institutions they had founded. The slave representation and the clause concerning fugitives from labor were then regarded as questions of little practical importance, while the authority, wholly to extinguish the slave traffic after 1808, and the inhibition of slavery by the ordinance of 1787 in the Northwest, were deemed fatal to the expansion and development of slavery and its malign influences.

The organization of the Federal Government, under the Constitution, demonstrated the impotency of the slave perpetuists and the anti-slavery sentiment of the people. Washington was unanimously borne into the Presidency, and he had avowed it to be "among his *first wishes* to see some plan adopted by which slavery in this country may be abolished by law." Adams was made Vice-President, and he held that, "consenting to slavery is a sacrilegious breach of trust." Jefferson was made Secretary of State, and he had declared that "the abolition of domestic slavery was the greatest object of desire;" that "the whole commerce between master and slave is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions—the most unremitting despotism on the one part and degrading submission on the other"—that "the statesman should be loaded with execration who, permitting one half the citizens to trample on the rights of the other, transforms those into despots, and these into enemies, destroys the morals of the one part, and the *amor patriæ* of the other;" that he "trembled for his country when he reflected that God was just; that his justice cannot sleep forever;" that "the Almighty has no attribute which can take side with us in such a contest." Hamilton was placed at the head of the Treasury, and he was a member of an anti-slavery society in New York, where he united in a petition for the emancipation of those who, "free by the laws of God, are held in slavery by the laws of the State." Jay was made Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and he believed slavery to be an "iniquity"—"a sin of crimson dye," and that "our prayers to Heaven would be impious until we abolished it." And from the presidency of an abolition society, this pure and stainless character was summoned by Washington to preside over that highest judicial tribunal. Gouverneur Morris believed that "slavery brought the curse of Heaven upon a country," and Washington sent him to represent his Government at the Court of France. Madison, Gerry, Langdon, King, Ellsworth, Sherman, Robert Morris, and other renowned statesmen, whose anti-slavery sentiments were recorded in the history of the country, held seats in the Senate and House of Representatives. Those patriotic statesmen, into whose keeping the American people intrusted the new-formed Government, were committed—fully committed—against the slave traffic, the extension of slavery, and for the ultimate emancipation of slavery in all America.

The foremost men of that day, not in the national councils, were equally committed against the slave system. They saw what Washington saw and expressed, "*the direful effects of slavery.*" Patrick Henry declared that "it would rejoice his *very soul*, that every one of his fellow-beings was emancipated;" that he "believed the time would come to abolish this lamentable evil;" that he "would transmit to their descendants, together with their slaves, a pity for their unhappy lot, and an abhorrence of slavery." James Iredell, soon to be summoned by Washington to the bench of the Supreme Court, in the Convention of North Carolina, avowed that, "when the entire abolition of slavery takes place, it will be an event which must be pleasing to every generous mind and every friend of human nature." The great Maryland lawyer, Luther Martin, declared "slavery is inconsistent with the genius of republicanism, and has a tendency to destroy those principles on which it is supported, as it *lessens the sense of the equal rights of mankind, and habituates us to tyranny and oppression.*" William Pinckney also declared, that "nothing is more clear, than that the effect of *slavery* is to destroy that REVERENCE FOR LIBERTY, which is THE VITAL PRINCIPLE OF A REPUBLIC;" that "the dreary system of partial bondage is iniquitous and most dishonorable to Maryland;" that, "by the *eternal principles of natural justice, no master has a right to hold his slave in bondage a single hour.*" And this great jurist uttered these prophetic words, which we see fulfilled in this age: "If slavery continues fifty years longer, *its effects will be seen in the decay of the spirit of liberty in the free States.*"

The enduring records of the Republic will carry down to after ages the sentiments of hostility to human bondage, uttered by the men who, in defence of perilled liberty, defied the power of the British Empire, and gave independence to the North American Republic. The history of that age is radiant with the glowing thoughts and burning words against African slavery, which British avarice planted on the virgin soil of the western world. Under their inspiring words, emancipation societies sprang into being in the South and in the North, and the noblest names that grace the pages of our history were enrolled upon the records of these societies. A national anti-slavery society was organized, and the highest hopes of the patriot, the philanthropist, and the Christian, seemed in process of realization. Colored freemen, many of whom had perilled their lives on the stricken fields of the Revolution, were allowed the rights of citizenship in some of the States. In Maryland and North Carolina they possessed this right, and young Tennessee, in 1796, came into the Union with a Constitution which permitted free colored men to exercise that high right of citizenship. In New York, Chancellor Robert R. Livingston, one of the foremost men of his age in America, reported against a bill referred to him for the gradual abolition of slavery, because it did not give to the emancipated bondmen the full rights of citizenship and the right of suffrage; for they "could not," he said, "be deprived of these essential rights without shocking the principles of equal liberty, and laying the foundation of an aristocracy of the most dangerous and malignant kind, rendering power permanent and hereditary in the hands of those persons who declare their origin through white ancestors only." Such were the liberal sentiments of a statesman of exalted character and large and varied experiences, who acted as a member of the committee to draft the Declaration of Independence, and as Secretary of Foreign Affairs under the Confederation; who administered the oath of office to the first President, and negotiated the treaty for the acquisition of Louisiana.

That slave power now compels public men, nur-

THE BUFFALO HISTORY MUSEUM

tured and reared amidst the influences of free institutions, to hasten with alacrity to disavow past sentiments and opinions, to accept the dogmas of the slave propaganda, and to join in hunting down old comrades. That power has established in the slave States a relentless despotism over the freedom of speech and of the press, and of correspondence through the mails. That power will not permit American citizens to entertain, utter, print, or circulate, sentiments and opinions concerning slavery, which were avowed by Jefferson, Henry, Mason, and the great men of Virginia of the Revolutionary era, or even by McDowell, Summers, and Randolph, in the Convention of 1830. The American citizen, living under a Constitution which guarantees free speech, holds that right subject to arbitrary laws or to the lawless acts of brutal mobs. George Fitzhugh, one of the apostles of slavery, the author of a work on "THE FAILURE OF FREE SOCIETY," in which he avows the doctrine that "slavery, BLACK OR WHITE, is right and necessary," now declares, with regard to the "right of private judgment, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of religion," that "the South takes care to trammel these sterner rights (so called) quite as efficiently, by an austere public opinion, as Louis Napoleon does by law, or by mere volition;" that "we propose to deter men from applying the axe to the root of our southern institutions (that is, by discussions or recurring to 'fundamental principles'), first by moral suasion or monition, next by tar and feathers, and, that failing, by the halter."

Sir, what a humiliating spectacle does the Republic now present to the gaze of mankind! I speak not of the millions of beings sunk from the lofty level of a common humanity down to the abject submission of unreasoning beasts of burden, nor of the laws that shrivel the mind and debase the soul of the bondman; but I speak of the deeds of lawlessness and inhumanity against free American citizens—deeds which shock every manly bosom. The mails daily bring us intelligence of the lawless deeds of brutal mobs, of the indignities perpetrated upon freemen guilty of no crime, unless it be a crime, in 1860, to cling to the opinions of the fathers of the Republic. The Post Office Department, the Postmaster General tells us, "pervades every channel of commerce, and every theatre of human enterprise; and while visiting, as it does kindly, every fireside, mingles with the throbbings of almost every heart in the land. In the amplitude of its beneficence, it ministers to all climes and creeds and pursuits, with the same eager readiness and with equal fullness of fidelity." This Post Office Department, in nearly half the States, is at the mercy of the stupidity or prejudice of postmasters, maddened by slavery fanaticism, and the correspondence of the people and the public journals may be examined, seized, and destroyed by these censors of despotism; and this may be, and is done under the open sanction of the Administration. Families are banished from their hearths and homes. Free colored men are forced to break the holy ties of kindred, seek homes among strangers, or be doomed to perpetual slavery, by laws which "propose," in the words of Judge Catron, of the Supreme Court, "*to commit an outrage—to perpetrate an oppression and cruelty.*" Surely there is no country in Christendom—no, not one—where the freemen of the United States are exposed to such insults, such indignities, such lawless oppressions, as in the slaveholding States of this Democratic Republic. The President calls our attention to the outrages perpetrated upon American citizens in Mexico. There is, sir, more security for the citizens of Massachusetts, for the eighteen million people of the North, in revolutionary Mexico, rent and torn by civil war, than in the slaveholding States. More insults, indignities, and outrages, have been heaped upon freemen in the slave States, during the past one hundred days, than have been perpetrated upon American citizens in Mexico during all the changes, and revolutions, and civil strifes which have marked the forty years of her independent existence.

Mr. President, the statesmen of the South, in this Chamber and in the other wing of the Capitol, frankly admit that a revolution concerning slavery, has been wrought in the public sentiment of the slaveholding States. This admitted revolution in the sentiments of the people of the South has wrought the change in the policy of the slave States and of the national Government, now so unmistakably manifest. How did the slaveholding class—a mere handful of men in this nation of twenty-six million freemen—work this change in the policy of the nation—a change which the sense of justice, the love of liberty, the humane and Christian sentiments of the age condemn? How did this small, and, so far as numbers are concerned, insignificant class of slaveholders achieve over the councils of Republican America an influence so potential?

This slaveholding class, which shapes and fashions at its pleasure the policy of the General Government, was borne into power by the Democratic party; and it is this day upheld in power by the Democratic party. Acquiring the ascendency in the Democratic party, this privileged class has imposed its hateful dogmas upon that party, compelling it to carry its flag, to fight its battles, and to bear the crushing burden of its crimes against the rights of human nature. Democrats of the free States, men born under the inspiring influences of free institutions, taught in free schools, instructed in free churches, have, during the last fifteen years, borne the banners of slavery extension, and often ingloriously fallen under the consuming wrath of a betrayed and indignant people. The Democracy of the North is as much the instrument of the Slave power for extending, upholding, and perpetuating human slavery in America, as is the army of the Emperor of Austria in maintaining his despotic rule in Hungary and Venetia.

Sir, when the army returned from Mexico, bringing with it the title-deeds to half a million square miles of free soil, the people of the free States desired it to be consecrated forever to freedom and free institutions. The Democracy of the North, obedient to the popular will, gave their support to the policy of slave prohibition; but the slave power imperiously demanded the abandonment of the principle of slave inhibition, and Democracy obeyed the peremptory mandate, abandoned the Jefferson proviso, and organized Utah and New Mexico without any guaranties for freedom. The slave power in the hour of its triumph in its territorial policy, required a new fugitive slave law; and the northern Democracy consented to the enactment of a law which violated every legal guaranty of freemen, shocked the sense of justice, and put in jeopardy the liberties of freemen, of which the legal rights of poorest and humblest outweigh the interests of every slaveholder in America. In 1854, the slave propagandists demanded the repeal of the prohibition of slavery in Kansas and Nebraska; and the Democracy, in complaisance to the slave power, repealed that prohibition. Five thousand armed men of Missouri marched into Kansas, seized the ballot-boxes, elected a Territorial Legislature, planted slavery, enacted inhuman and unchristian laws for its support. The slave power demanded the enforcement of those arbitrary enactments by the General Government, and President Pierce upheld them with the bayonets of the army; and in this he was supported by the Democracy of the North. The slave power demanded that Governor Walker and Secretary Stanton should be removed for exposing the pro-slavery frauds of the October election of

THE BUFFALO HISTORY MUSEUM

1857; and President Buchanan forced Walker to resign, and removed Stanton, who would not bend; and the Democracy of the North upheld the action of the President.

To crown the long series of outrages upon the people of Kansas the slave power demanded that Congress should force the Lecompton Constitution, the product of fraud and violence, upon an unwilling and protesting people; and the Democracy of the North, with a few exceptions, responded to that infamous demand. The slave power requires the abandonment of the doctrine, that the people of a Territory can legislate against slavery, and the acceptance of the dogma that the Constitution protects slavery as property in the Territories; and the leaders of the Democracy of the North in this chamber with two or three exceptions, accept this new creed, which makes every foot of the Territories of the Republic slave soil. The acknowledged chiefs of the slave power are demanding a national slave code for the Territories; and already the aspiring leaders of the Democracy of the North are hastening to give assurances that they are prepared to acquiesce in that extraordinary demand. The chiefs of the slave propaganda are turning their lustful eyes to Cuba, Central America, and Mexico, for territory in which to plant slavery; for they hold, that in whatever territory acquired, or to be acquired, the flag of the Union waves, slavery for the African, and not freedom for all men, is inscribed on its folds. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BROWN], one of the acknowledged leaders of the slaveholding class, declares to his constituents, with the frankness that marks his character:

"*I want Cuba;* I want Tamaulipas, Potosi, and one or two other Mexican States; and *I want them all for the same reason—for the planting and spreading of slavery.* And a footing in Central America will powerfully aid us in acquiring those other States. Yes; *I want these countries for the spread of slavery.* I would spread the blessings of slavery, *like the religion of our Divine Master*, to the uttermost ends of the earth; and, rebellious and wicked as the Yankees have been, *I would even extend it to them.*"

These dreams of empires in which to plant slavery fill the minds of the leaders of the slave propaganda; and the President, in asking authority to march the army into Mexico and the Senator from Louisiana, [Mr. SLIDELL,] in pressing his Cuba Scheme, are acting in response to these ideas of conquest and acquisition. Up to this hour, the slave propagandists have never made a requisition upon the northern Democrats which has not been complied with, although many of them have sealed their ready servility with political martyrdom.

Sir, to arrest the aggressive policy of the slave propaganda, which is perverting the Constitution, subverting the institutions, disturbing the repose of the country, endangering the stability of the Union, and bringing reproach upon the American name; and to restore the Government to the policy of its illustrious founders, an organization has been formed which calls itself the Republican party. This party, which embraces in its organization a million and a half of intelligent and patriotic freemen, proclaims no new doctrine; it proposes no new experiments. Upon the great and overshadowing question of slavery in America, the Republican party accepts the doctrines of the Revolutionary fathers of the North and of the South. The Republican party sees, as Washington saw, "*the direful effects of slavery;*" it believes, with Henry, that "*slavery is a lamentable evil;*" with Luther Martin, that "*slavery is inconsistent with the genius of Republicanism;*" with Madison, that "*slavery is a dreadful calamity;*" that "*imbecility is ever attendant upon a country filled with slaves;*" with Monroe, that "*slavery has preyed upon the very vitals of the Union, and has been prejudicial to all the States in which it has existed.*" Concurring in these opinions of these illustrious patriots and statesmen of the South, the Republican party proposes to preserve the vast territorial possessions of the Republic from "the direful effects" of this "dreadful calamity" which "has preyed upon the vitals of the Union," by applying to, and engraving upon, those Territorial possessions these words, "*slavery shall be* AND IS FOREVER *prohibited;*" words which came from the pen of Jefferson, were embodied in the ordinance of 1787, and stamped on every foot of the virgin sods of the Northwest.

Believing freedom to be national, and slavery to be local and sectional, "a mere municipal regulation," in the words of the Supreme Court, "founded upon and limited to the verge of the State law," for which the people of each State that tolerates it are alone responsible, the Republican party joins issue with the sectionalized Democracy, which, under the lead of men whose vital and animating principle is the propagation of slavery, accepts the monstrous dogma that slavery by virtue of the Constitution, exists in all the Territories. Accepting this doctrine, the Democracy repealed the prohibition of slavery in Kansas and Nebraska, and resists all Congressional action. Accepting this doctrine, the Democracy in those Territories resists Territorial acts to prohibit slavery, and Government officials veto their enactments. Accepting this doctrine, the Democratic Legislature of New Mexico, under the lead of Democratic Government officials, prompted by Mr. OTERO, the Democratic Delegate, "at the solicitation of General R. DAVIS, of Mississippi," have enacted a brutal and bloody slave code. Already the Democratic chiefs of the slave power are demanding the enactment of a slave code by Congress, and the leaders of the Democracy are hastening to give them assurances that "if," in the words of the Vice President, "this constitutional right to hold slaves as property in the Territories cannot be enforced for want of proper legislation to enforce it, sufficient legislation must be passed, or our Government is a failure."

Rejecting the dogmas accepted by the Democracy, and holding, with the Republican fathers, that Slavery cannot exist in the Territories except by positive law, and that Congress and the people of the Territories may exclude it, the Republican party takes issue with the national Democracy, and appeals to the intelligent patriotism of the country. It appeals not to the local and temporary interests of sections, but to the lasting interests of the whole country; not to the passions and pride of classes, but to the sober judgment, the sense of justice, the love of liberty, and the humane and Christian sentiments of all classes.

Sir, in the progress of the contests of the past six years between the interests of slave labor and the the rights of free labor in the infant empires we are creating in the West, the power of the northern Democracy has been broken, and its leaders have ingloriously fallen. Falling in the great battle of "JUSTICE IN CONFLICT," in the words of Mr. Jefferson, "WITH AVARICE AND OPPRESSION," the once powerful chiefs of the northern Democracy are forced to submit to the bitter mortification of realizing not only their lost power, but their loss of influence in the councils of the party they have so faithfully followed. The organization of the committees in this chamber cannot but remind the northern Democratic senators, who yet linger here, of their waning power over the legislation of the country, over their political associates; and their duty to follow rather than to lead; to receive orders rather than to give them. Now, the leaders of the Democratic party, the men who dictate its principles and shape its

THE BUFFALO HISTORY MUSEUM

policy are in the South. Well might Mr. KEITT boastingly say, as he did on a recent occasion to the people of South Carolina, "issues have been made which have tried the Democratic party;" "its northern hosts have melted away;" "as the northern wing declined, the southern wing strengthened;" "the slavery agitation has weakened the party at the North and strengthened it at the South:" "the whole machinery of the party has fallen into the hands of the South," and "the South has the general control of the Democratic party."

Having, Mr. President, forced the northern Democrats, by threats of political proscription, to repudiate the principle of slavery restriction in the Territories; having forced Mr. Calhoun's dogma upon the Democratic organization; having won the "general control," and secured the "whole machinery," of the Democratic party, these southern leaders of the slave Democracy, now masters of the Government, are pleased to assume that the policy of the Republican party, sanctioned as it has been, by the great statesmen of the past, of the North and South, is a policy of aggression upon the South; and that its success in 1860 will be cause for the dissolution of the Union and the overthrow of the Republic. The chiefs of the slave propaganda, the accepted leaders of the Democratic party, in the public press, in the forum of the people in the State Legislatures, and in these chambers, are predicting disunion, arguing disunion, and threatening disunion. Every breeze from the South is burdened with these disunion predictions, arguments and threats. In these chambers our ears are fatigued with listening to these disloyal, unpatriotic, revolutionary, but thank God, impotent avowals! That some of the actors in THIS BROAD FARCE now being played before the nation are in earnest, that they would shiver the Union "from turret to foundation stone," no one who has watched their turbulent career can for a moment doubt; but the vigor of their blow, is not equal to the vehemence of their desire. These actors have before shown that they are quite prudent enough to "let *I dare not* wait upon *I would*." This DISUNION FARCE, which the leaders of the slave-extending, slave-perpetuating Democracy, have put upon the national stage, and through the parts of which so many actors are moving with such tragic strut, is intended to startle and appall the timid, make the servility of the servile still more abject, rouse the selfish instincts of that nerveless conservativism which has ever opposed every useful reform, and wailed over every rotten institution as it fell; and thus, through the cowardly fears and selfishness of the optimists and quietists, retain their grasp on power. Sir, we shall see whether this disloyal conspiracy, will alarm the eighteen million northern freemen; whether the actors in this disunion farce will play a winning game, or whether the insulted patriotism of the country, North and South, will not rebuke this exhibition of madness and folly, and dismiss these actors from the service of that Union they threaten to subvert and destroy.

But this is not, sir, the first time this farce of disunion has been played. When the Republican party sprung into being in 1856, to arrest the aggressions of slavery, to redress the wrongs of the people of Kansas, the leading presses and politicians of the Democracy in the South then predicted, argued and threatened, the dissolution of the Union, if Fremont should be elected. The success of this disunion play in 1856, as well as their own "yawning need" in 1860, may have prompted the Democratic managers to put the old farce upon the stage, in the imposing form now witnessed.

Now, Mr. President, I intend to place before the Senate, and, as far as I can, before the patriotic, liberty-loving, and Union-loving men of the free States the predictions of disunion, the arguments for disunion, and the menaces of disunion, made by some of the presses and some of the men in the interests of slavery—presses that are the exponents of, and men who are the acknowledged leaders of, the sectionalized, slave-extending Democracy. I want the people of Massachusetts and of the country to see that the political secessionists and disunionists are the trusted exponents and the accepted leaders of the National Democracy. I want the alarmed conservatives of the North, who hasten into Union-saving meetings, to see and to realize that the men who are now blurting their disunion sentiments into the unwilling ear of a loyal people, are the leaders of that party which they by their shrinking timidity are upholding in power. I want the deluded masses of the northern Democracy to see the hypocrisy, the arrant cowardice, of their leaders at home, who are fatiguing the weary ear of the country with their worn-out professions of love and devotion to the Union, while they dare not rebuke the disloyal avowals and menaces of the leaders they follow with craven soul and fettered lip.

When, Mr. President, the Republican party, summoned into being and into action in 1856, by the aggressions of slavery, by the crimes against the people of Kansas, appealed in tones as earnest as ever issued from human lips, to the American people, to their sense of justice, their love of liberty, their emotions of humanity, and their sentiments of patriotism, to all that is highest, noblest, holiest, in human nature, to rescue the Government, arrest slavery extension, redress the wrongs of the people, and give repose to the country, by restoring the Government to the policy of Washington and Jefferson, Democratic presses and Democratic leaders, whose vital and animating principle is the propagation and expansion of human slavery on the North American continent, raised the startling war-cry of disunion. Timid and selfish conservatism, which saw, unmoved, liberty cloven down in a distant Territory, and heard the imploring appeals for protection of freemen whose sacked and burning cabins illumed the midnight skies, shrank appalled when it heard this cry of disunion, opened its long purse, and continued the destinies of the country in the keeping of men who avowed their intention to ruin if they could not rule it.

Sir, when that uncertain contest was going on, when the election of Fremont seemed to the leaders of the Democracy not only possible, but probable, the senator from Louisiana, [Mr. SLIDELL,] one of the most skillful leaders of the slave Democracy—the acknowledged friend and champion of Mr. Buchanan—declared to the country that "if Fremont should be elected, the Union would be dissolved." The bold, dashing, and out-spoken senator from Georgia [Mr. TOOMBS] declared, with emphasis, that, "if Fremont was elected, the Union would be dissolved, and ought to be dissolved." The senator from Virginia, [Mr. MASON,] then, as now, at the head of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who avowed on the floor of the Senate that "the South has the right to the natural expansion of slavery, as an element of political power," declared in a public letter that unless the aggression upon the rights of the South, as he was pleased to designate the resistance of the people of the North against slavery extension, ceased, he was for "the separation of these States." Mr. Butler, of South Carolina, then a leading member of the body, which placed him at the head of the important Committee of the Judiciary, said:

"When Fremont is elected, we must rely upon what we have—a good State Government. Every Governor of the South should call the Legislature of his State together, and have measures of the South decided upon. *If they did not, and submit to the degradation, they would deserve the fate of slaves. I should advise my Legislature to go at the tap of the drum.*"

THE BUFFALO HISTORY MUSEUM

Sir, I might quote other declarations of senators, in which these ideas are expressed; but I must pass on. In the House, as the records will bear evidence, these sentiments were profusely uttered by the men who uphold the course of oppression in Kansas, and dictated the policy of the Democratic party. Mr. KEITT, in a fiery, and vehement speech to the people Lynchburg, Virginia, exclaimed, in view of the apprehended election of Fremont:

"I tell you now, that if Fremont is elected, *adherence to the Union is treason to liberty*, [Loud cheers.] I tell you now, that the southern man who will submit to his election is a *traitor and a coward*. [Enthusiastic cheers.]"

This speech, so contemptuous, so defiant toward the people of the North, so emphatic in its avowals of disunion, was promptly indorsed as "sound doctrine" by John B. Floyd, now Mr. Buchanan's Secretary of War—a gentleman of whom the "Boston Post," the leading Administration organ of New England, in 1850, said, "henceforth he must be treated as a disunionist, and the most dangerous of them all." In the autumn of 1856, Mr. Brooks, of South Carolina, received from the people of his district an ovation. Senator BUTLER and the senator from Georgia [Mr. TOOMBS] attended, and other Southern Democratic leaders sent applauding letters. To the assembled people of his district, Mr. BROOKS said:

"We have the issue upon us now; and how are we to meet it? I tell you, fellow citizens, from the bottom of my heart, that the only mode which I think available for meeting it *is just to tear the Constitution of the United States, trample it under foot, and form a Southern Confederacy, every State of which will be a slaveholding State.* [Loud and prolonged cheers.] I believe it, as I stand in the face of my Maker; I believe it on my responsibility to you as your honored representative, that *the only hope of the South is in the South, and that the only available means of making that hope effective is to cut asunder the bonds that tie us together, and take our separate position in the family of nations.* These are my opinions. They have always been my opinions. *I have been a disunionist from the time I could think.*" . .

"Now, fellow-citizens, I have told you very frankly and undisguisedly, that I believe *the only hope of the South is in dissolving the bonds which connect us with the Government—in separating the living body from the dead carcass.* If I was the commander of an army, *I never would post a sentinel who would not swear that slavery is right.*" . . .

"I speak on my individual responsibility: *If Fremont be elected President of the United States, I am for the people in their majesty rising above the law and leaders, taking the power into their own hands, going by concert or not by concert, and laying the strong arm of southern freemen upon the Treasury and archives of the Government.* [Applause.]"

These emphatic avowals of disunion were applauded by the people who had, by a unanimous vote, sustained his action, and commissioned him to speak for them in this Capitol. Well might the "Charleston Mercury" declare, as it has, that—

"*Upon the policy of dissolving the Union, of separating the South from her northern enemies, and establishing a southern Confederacy, parties, presses, politicians, and people, were a unit. There is not a single public man in her limits, not one of her present representatives or senators in Congress, who is not pledged to the lips in favor of disunion.* Indeed, we well remember that one of the most prominent leaders of the coöperation party, when taunted with submission, rebuked the thought by saying, '*that in opposing secession, he only took a step backward to strike a blow more deadly against the Union.*'"

Sir, the erratic, aspiring, blustering Wise, who "would introduce slavery into the heart of the North," who "would allow slavery to pour itself out without restraint, and find no limit but the Southern Ocean," in the autumn of 1856, told the people of Virginia that—

"The South could not, without degradation, submit to the election of a Black Republican President. To tell me we should submit to the election of a Black Republican, under circumstances like these, is to tell me that Virginia and the fourteen slave States are already subjugated and degraded, [cheers;] that the southern people are without spirit, and without purpose to defend the rights they know and dare not maintain. [Cheers.] If you submit to the election of Fremont, you will prove what Seward and Burlingame said to be true—that the South cannot be kicked out of the Union."

He avowed his readiness to put the military force of Virginia upon a war footing; and he gave the valorous assurance to his disunion associates, that "the chivalry" of Virginia "would hew its bright way through all opposing legions." Rumor said, and I believe truly, that this Democratic aspirant to the Presidency held correspondence with southern governors, to concert measures preparatory to disunion; that he and his disunion compeers organized a plot to seize the arsenal at Harper's Ferry, to take possession of the navy yard at Norfolk, and inaugurate rebellion, revolution, and disunion, in the event of Fremont's success.

The Washington correspondent of the "New Orleans Delta," a journal high in the confidence of the Pierce administration, wrote:

"It is already arranged, in the event of Fremont's election, or a failure to elect by the people, to call the Legislatures of Virginia, South Carolina, and Georgia, to concert measures to withdraw from the Union before Fremont can get possession of the army and navy and the purse-strings of Government. *Governor Wise is actively at work already in the matter. The South can rely on the President in the emergency contemplated.* The question now is, whether the people of the South will sustain their leaders."

Mr. Corry, of Ohio, reports Mr. Banks of Virginia, as having said to him, a few days after the election in 1856, that—

"The South would have dissolved the Union if Fremont had been elected President of the United States; that Governor Wise and the Virginia leaders were ready to take the field—march on Washington, depose the Federal officers, take the Treasury, archives, buildings, grounds, etc.—declare the Confederation *de facto* overthrown. He said the thing would have been easy; there were thirty thousand men ready; twenty thousand cavalry; sets of accoutrements; that the public mind was sufficiently excited to overcome all domestic resistance, and that they could whip the North in the fight."

A Union meeting was recently held at Knoxville, Tennessee. At this meeting, Judge Daily, recently of Georgia, submitted a series of resolutions as an amendment to the resolutions of the committee, and made an extreme Southern speech in support of them. In this speech, he said that—

"During the Presidential contest, Gov. Wise had addressed letters to all the southern governors, and that *the one to the governor of Florida had been shown him, in which Gov. Wise said that he had an army in readiness to prevent Fremont from taking his seat* if elected, and asking the coöperation of those to whom he wrote."

Evidence of this disloyal, revolutionary, and treasonable course of Henry A. Wise is also furnished by Charles J. Faulkner, late representative of the Harper's Ferry district, chairman of the Congressional Democratic Committee in 1856, and now minister to France. At a Democratic meeting recently held in Virginia, over which Mr. Faulkner presided, he said:

THE BUFFALO HISTORY MUSEUM

"When that noble and gallant son of Virginia, Henry A. Wise, declared, as was said he did in October, 1856, that, if Fremont should be elected, HE WOULD SEIZE THE NATIONAL ARSENAL AT HARPER'S FERRY, how few would, at that time, have justified so bold and decided a measure? *It is the fortune of some great and gifted minds to see far in advance of their contemporaries.* Should William H. Seward be elected in 1860, where is the man now in our midst *who would not call for the impeachment of a Governor of a Virginia who would silently suffer that armory to pass under the control of such an Executive head!*"

This "noble and gallant son of Virginia" who in 1856, "saw far in advance of his contemporaries," who was ready, if Fremont had been elected, "to seize the arsenal at Harper's Ferry," is now looking with hungry eye to the Charleston Convention, and is now the applauded and favorite hero of a class of men in the North, who are stammering into the ears of a doubting people their uxorious love of the Union; and this Democratic orator, who would demand the impeachment of a governor of Virginia if he should permit the arsenal at Harper's Ferry to pass under the control of WILLIAM H. SEWARD, if elected to the Presidency, is nominated by a Democratic President, and confirmed by the united voice of the Democratic senators, to represent the Republic at the Court of Louis Napoleon. This Democratic Administration, and this Democratic party, which invokes the support of the Union-loving, conservative men of the free States, send to the proudest monarch of the Old World the man who uttered this insurrectionary and disloyal sentiment. Yes, sir; Democrats, with the accents of Union upon their lips, sanction the appointment of a man who is avowedly in favor of civil war and disunion. Let the real friends of law, of order, of the unity of the Republic, mark and remember this want of fidelity to the Union, by the Administration and the men who lead the Democratic party.

Sir, the "Richmond Enquirer," the leading Democratic organ south of the Potomac, during the canvass of 1856, avowedly advocated disunion. That exponent of the slave Democracy said:

"Sumner, and Sumner's friends, must be punished and silenced. Either such wretches must be hung or put in the penitentiary, or the South should prepare at once to quit the Union."

"If Fremont is elected, the Union will not last an hour after Mr. Pierce's term expires."

"If Fremont is elected, it will be the duty of the South to dissolve the Union and form a southern Confederacy."

"Let the South present a compact and undivided front. Let her, if possible, detach Pennsylvania and southern Ohio, southern Indiana, and southern Illinois, from the North, and make the highlands between the Ohio and the lakes the dividing line. Let the South treat with California; and, if necessary, ally herself with Russia, with Cuba, and Brazil."

Sir, this journal, which, during the canvass, had avowed the rankest disunion sentiments—this journal, which had been the trumpet of the alarmists, after the election had been won by the aid, the "material aid," of alarmed and quaking conservatism, very naively announced to the victims of this disunion panic that "*Governor Wise threatened disunion only to save the Union!*" Yes, sir; the valiant Wise, ready to put the military force of his dominions on a war footing; ready to hew his bright way through all opposing legions; ready to seize Harper's Ferry, "only threatened disunion to save the Union!" Patriotic Wise! Who, in view of the sagacious patriotism of that "noble and gallant son of Virginia," will not accept the tribute of the admiring Faulkner, that "it is the fortune of some great and gifted minds to see far in advance of their contemporaries?" May not shivering, despairing conservatism indulge the faint hope that other "noble and gallant sons of Virginia" and of the sunny South may, in humble imitation of the far-seeing Wise, be "threatening disunion only to save the Union?"

We are entering, Mr. President, upon another Presidential election; another great struggle for supremacy in the national councils between the opposing forces of slavery extension and slavery restriction. The nation once more presents to mankind "the interesting spectacle of justice in conflict with avarice and oppression." This "conflict" is stirring the country to its profoundest depths. Conscious of their waning power, the advocates of slavery expansion are again haughtily menacing the dissolution of the Union in the event of their defeat by the people. Again, in the public press, in assemblages of the people, in State legislatures, and in these chambers, disloyal and revolutionary threats are made, to intimidate the people.

Sir, the senator from Georgia, before the meeting of Congress, boasted before the people of his State, that "the proud and enviable condition of the poor men in the South, compared to the degraded WHITE SLAVES OF THE NORTH, is owing to the existence of African slavery in the South."

Mr. IVERSON. Will the senator allow me to ask which senator from Georgia he refers to?

Mr. WILSON. The senator who is now on the floor.

Mr. IVERSON. Then, that is a mistake. I never used any such language.

Mr. WILSON. I quoted it from a Georgia paper, which published it at the time.

Mr. IVERSON. I deny it positively. My speech is on record and in print. The gentleman shall have a copy of it, if he wants one.

Mr. WILSON. It was a speech made in Georgia during the summer.

Mr. IVERSON. I made no such declaration as that. What I did say was simply this: that the condition of African slavery at the South elevated the poor white man; but I did not speak of the poor people of the North as slaves, by any means.

Mr. WILSON. Then the senator is misquoted by his own papers, and I withdraw it as far as that is concerned. I will go on with the rest of the quotation from the same speech, and the senator can deny that or not. The senator, at the same meeting where he is reported to have used the words which he now disclaims, and which I am glad he disclaims, is reported to have said:

"*Slavery must be maintained—in the Union, if possible; out of it, if necessary; peaceably if we may, forcibly if we must.*"

Mr. IVERSON. I said that.

Mr. WILSON. And the senator drew this flattering view of a southern Confederation:

"In a confederated government of their own, the southern States would enjoy sources of wealth, prosperity, and power, unsurpassed by any nation on earth. No neutrality laws would restrain our adventurous sons. Our expanding policy would stretch far beyond present limits. Central America would join her destiny to ours, and so would Cuba, now withheld from us by the voice and votes of Abolition enemies."

Coming in this chamber, the honorable senator early sought occasion to say:

"Sir, I will tell you what I would do, if I had the control of the southern members of this House and the other, when you elect JOHN SHERMAN. If I had control of the public sentiment, the very moment you elect JOHN SHERMAN, thus giving to the South the example of insult as well as injury, I would walk, every one of us, out of the Halls of this Capitol, and consult our constituents; and I would never enter again until I was bade to do so by those who had the right to control me. Sir, I go further than that. I would coun-

THE BUFFALO HISTORY MUSEUM

sel my constituents instantly to dissolve all political ties with a party and a people who thus trample on our rights. That is what I would do."

In a carefully-prepared and very elaborate speech recently delivered, the senator from Georgia said:

"Sir, there is but one path of safety to the South; but one mode of preserving her institution of domestic slavery; and that is a confederacy of States having no incongruous and opposing elements—a confederacy of slave States alone, with homogeneous language, laws, interests, and institutions. Under such a confederated Republic, with a Constitution which should shut out the approach and entrance of all incongruous and conflicting elements, which should protect the institution from change, and keep the whole nation ever bound to its preservation, by an unchangeable fundamental law, the fifteen slave States, with their power of expansion, would present to the world the most free, prosperous, and happy nation on the face of the wide earth.

"Sir, with these views, and with the firm conviction which I have entertained for many years, and which recent events have only seemed to confirm, that the 'irrepressible conflict' between the two sections must and will go on, and with accumulated speed, and must end, in the Union, with the total extinction of African slavery in the southern States, that I have announced my determination to approve and urge the southern States to dissolve the Union upon the election of a Black Republican to the Presidency of the United States, by a sectional northern party, and upon a platform of opposition and hostility to southern slavery."

The senator from Mississippi [Mr. BROWN], in the speech to his constituents from which I have already quoted, and in which he avows his desire to acquire territory in Central America and Mexico, "to plant slavery in," says:

"Whether we can obtain the territory while the Union lasts, I do not know; I fear we cannot. But I would make an honest effort, and if we failed, I would go out of the Union, and try it there. I speak plainly—I would make a refusal to acquire territory, because it was to be slave territory, a cause for disunion, just as I would make the refusal to admit a new State, because it was to be a slave State, a cause for disunion."

Surely no one can mistake the position of the senator. If the people of the free States, who believe slavery to be what Henry Clay said it was, "a curse," "a wrong—a grievous wrong," that "no contingency could make right," should refuse to acquire territory "because it was to be slave territory," he would make that refusal "cause for disunion." The senator has laid upon our desks an address, delivered in the Capitol of the State he so ably and faithfully represents; and in this address, I find this declaration:

"The election of Mr. SEWARD, or any other man of his party, is not, *per se*, justifiable ground for dissolving the *Union*. But the *act* of putting the Government in the hands of men who mean to use it for our subjugation, ought to be resisted, even to the disruption of every tie that binds us to the Union."

On the 6th of July, the senator from Mississippi, [Mr. DAVIS,] whose ability and large and varied information are acknowledged by the Senate and the country, delivered an elaborate address to the people of his State. By common consent, the country recognizes the senator from Mississippi as one of the foremost leaders of his section and his party, and his opinions command attention and consideration. In this address, the honorable senator says:

"For myself, I say, as I said on a former occasion, in the contingency of the election of a President on the platform of Mr. SEWARD'S Rochester speech, let the Union be dissolved. Let the 'great but not the greatest of evils,' come."

On the 11th of November, 1858, after his return from a visit of several months to New England, the senator addressed the people of his State at Jackson. In this address, the senator is reported to have said, "if the Republicans should elect a President, the question would be presented, what should the South do? For his part, he had but *one answer to give*. When that happened, when the Government was in hostile hands, when the Presidency and the houses of legislation were controlled by the enemies of the South, *he was for asserting the independence of Mississippi; he was for immediate withdrawal from the Union.*" And in view of the aspect of public affairs, the honorable senator "advised the people of the South to turn their old muskets into Minie rifles, prepare powder, shot, shell, ammunition of all kinds, and fortifications, so as to be ready against any emergency."

The senator from Alabama [Mr. CLAY] early addressed the Senate upon the resolution introduced by the senator from Virginia, [Mr. MASON;] and in this speech, prepared with the elaborate care that Senator is accustomed to bestow upon the subjects he discusses here, the senator assumes, in effect, the position that it is impossible for the people of the South to live under a Government administered by the Republican party. He asks:

"Do you suppose that we intend to bow our necks to the yoke? that we intend to submit to the domination of our enemies? that we intend to sit here in your presence as hostages for the good behavior of our conquered people—a people who will be, under your administration, not as sovereigns to rule but as subjects to be governed?"

In response, the senator says:

"I make no predictions, no promise for my State; but, in conclusion, will only say, that if she is faithful to the pledges she has made and principles she has professed—if she is true to her own interest and her own honor—if she is not recreant to all that State pride, integrity and duty demand—she will never submit to your authority. I will add, that unless she, and all the southern States of this Union, with perhaps but two, or, at most, three exceptions, are not faithless to the pledges they have given, *they will never submit to the government of a President professing your political faith and elected by your sectional majority.*"

When the senator from Alabama took his seat, the senator from California [Mr. GWIN] rose, and declared that he considered "it as the inevitable result, that the South should prepare for resistance in the event of the election of a Republican President." The senator went on to argue that the South must, could and would, dissolve the Union, if the Republican party succeed in the coming election. That senator went on to show how the South could carry out the scheme of disunion; how she could seize the public property within her limits; that, by doing so, before the Government passed into the control of such an Administration, it could put it out of the power of the Administration to administer the Government in that portion of the country. And he declared that "it is impossible for a Republican President to administer this Government over the slaveholding States of the Confederacy;" and that "the election of a Republican President is the inevitable destruction of this Confederacy."

The senator from Georgia [Mr. TOOMBS] began his speech yeterday by solemnly announcing that the country was in the midst of a civil revolution, and closed it by imploring the freemen of the State he represents to "redeem their pledge," and "never permit this Federal Government to pass into the traitorous hands of the Black Republican party." He calls upon the people of Georgia to "listen to 'no vain babblings,' to no treacherous jargon about 'overt acts;' they have already been committed.

THE BUFFALO HISTORY MUSEUM

Defend yourselves, the enemy is at your door; wait not to meet him at the hearthstone—meet him at the doorsill, and drive him from the temple of liberty, or pull down its pillars and involve him in a common ruin."

The senator from North Carolina [Mr. CLINGMAN] assures us that in the South "there are hundreds of disunionists now where there was one ten years ago;" that in some of the States men who "would willingly to-day see the Union dissolved" are in the majority, and in other States a large class of men are "ready to unite with them upon the happening of a cause." And he says:

"In my judgment, the election of the Presidential candidate of the Black Republican party will furnish that cause."

To the suggestion that they "ought to wait for some overt act," the senator says:

"No other '*overt act*' can so imperatively demand resistance on our part as the simple election of their candidate. Their organization is one of avowed hostility, and they come against us as *enemies*."

Referring to the distinguished senator from New York [Mr. SEWARD], he declares that—

"The objections are not personal merely to this senator, but apply equally to any member of the party elected by it. It has, in fact, been suggested that, as a matter of prudence, for the first election they should choose a southern free-soiler. Would the colonies have submitted more willingly to Benedict Arnold than to Lord Cornwallis?"

But the senator seems to be in favor of the secession of the States, but not of the secession of members of Congress. He says:

"I may say, however, that I do not think there will be any secession of the southern members of Congress from this Capitol. It has always struck me that this is a point not to be voluntarily surrendered to the public enemy."

The senator from North Carolina evidently indulges in the pleasing illusion that "the public enemy," as he is pleased to characterize his fellow-countrymen, will abandon the Capitol, if "the southern members of Congress" remain in the Capitol. "If lives should be lost here," exclaims the senator, "it would seem poetically just that this should occur!" If, after this declaration of seeming valor, the Republicans, in the event of their success in November, do not flee from the Capitol with as much haste as did the "chivalry" of this region in the late war with England, I am quite sure the senator from North Carolina, who is "struck" with the original idea "that this is a point not to be voluntarily surrendered to the public enemy," will be disappointed in his expectations. But the senator goes on to express his emotions of contempt for men of the non-resistant school. "I cannot find," says the senator, "words enough to express my abhorrence and detestation of such creatures as Garrison and Wendell Phillips, who stimulate others to deeds of blood, and, at the same time, are so cowardly that they avoid all danger themselves." This expression of "abhorrence and detestation" for such non-combatants, such "cowardly creatures," is, I suppose, intended to admonish us on this side of the chamber that the senator is terribly in earnest when he makes proclamation of his wishes in these words:

"*As from this Capitol so much has gone forth to inflame the public mind, if our countrymen are to be involved in a bloody struggle, I trust in God that the first fruits of the collision may be reaped here.*"

This language, Mr. President, admits of but one interpretation. Gentlemen from the South, who are in favor of a dissolution of the Union, do not intend, in so doing, to secede from this Capitol, nor surrender it to those who may remain within the Union. Having declared that, if lives are to be sacrificed, it will be poetically just that they should be sacrificed here on this floor; and that, as so much has gone forth from this Capitol to inflame the public mind, it is but proper that the first fruit of the struggle should be reaped here, the senator gives us, therefore, distinctly to understand that there may be a physical collision—"a bloody struggle;" that the scene of this conflict is to be the legislative halls of this Capitol. To simply say, in reply to this threat, that northern senators cannot thus be intimidated, is too tame and commonplace to meet the exigency. Therefore, I take it upon myself to inform the senator from North Carolina, that the people of the free States have sent their representatives here, not to fight, but to legislate; not to mingle in personal combats, but to deliberate for the good of the whole country; not to shed the blood of their fellow-members, but to maintain the supremacy of the Constitution and uphold the Union—and this they will endeavor to do here, in the legislative halls of the Capitol, at all events and at every hazard. In the performance of their duties, they will not invade the rights of others, nor permit any infringement of their own. They will invite no collision, they will commence no attack; but they will discharge all their obligations to their constituents, and maintain the Government and institutions of their country in the face of all conceivable consequences. Whoever thinks otherwise has not studied either the history of the people of the free States, or the character of the men dwelling in that section of the Union, or the philosophy of the exigency which the senator from North Carolina seems to invoke. The freemen of the North have not been accustomed to vaunt their courage in words; they have preferred to illustrate it by deeds. They are not fighting men by profession, nor accustomed to street broils, nor contests on the "field of honor," falsely so called, nor are they habitual wearers of deadly weapons. Therefore it is that when driven into bloody collisions, and especially on sudden emergencies, it is as true in fact as it is sound in philosophy, that they are more desperate and determined, and more reckless of consequences to themselves and to their antagonists, than are those who are more accustomed to contemplate such collisions. The tightest band, when once broken, recoils with the wildest power. So much for the people of the free States. As to their representatives in this Capitol I will say, that if, while in the discharge of their duties here, they are assaulted with deadly intent, I give the senator from North Carolina due notice, here, to-day, that those assaults will be repelled and retaliated by sons who will not dishonor fathers that fought at Bunker Hill and conquered at Saratoga, that trampled the soil of Chippewa and Lundy's Lane to a bloody mire, and vindicated sailors' rights and national honor on the high seas in the second war of independence. Reluctant to enter into such a contest, yet once in, they will be quite as reluctant to leave it. Though they may not be the first to go into the struggle, they will be the last to abandon it in dishonor. Though they will not provoke nor commence the conflict, they will do their best to conquer when the strife begins. So much their constituents will demand of them when the "bloody struggle" the senator contemplates is forced upon them; and they will not be disappointed when the exigency comes. I say no more; I wait the issue, and bide my time.

Mr. President, during the protracted and excited contest in the other end of the Capitol, the leaders of the Democracy have avowed the rankest disunion

THE BUFFALO HISTORY MUSEUM

sentiments; and these avowals of disloyalty to the Union have been often rapturously applauded on the Democratic side of the chamber, and in the galleries, crowded, as they have often been, by Government officials or Government contractors or dependents. Sir, if the Union-loving, liberty-loving, patriotic men of the country could have heard these menaces of disunion; could have witnessed the applauding throngs in the galleries, and the applauding Democracy on the floor; and could have witnessed the Democratic smiles, the Democratic nods, and the Democratic congratulations, they would visit upon the actors in this farce, and upon their compeers here and at home, the stern rebuke and withering scorn of an indignant people.

Early in the session, Mr. NELSON, of Tennessee, a distinguished member of the southern Opposition, rebuked the disunion sentiments which had been so profusely scattered through the debates by the secessionists; and he avowed his devotion to the Union in tones of thrilling eloquence. His patriotic and national sentiments received the enthusiastic applause of the southern Opposition and the Republicans. The patriotic sentiments of the eloquent Tennessean, reminding us of the days, before the advent into these halls of the secession disciples of Calhoun, when the followers of Clay—ay, and of Jackson, too—had made the chambers echo with sentiments of devotion to the Union, seemed to grate harshly upon Democratic ears.

Mr. PRYOR, of Virginia, who, in 1856, as one of the editors of the "Richmond Enquirer," echoed the disunion sentiments of Gov. Wise, rose and propounded to Mr. NELSON this question:

"Would you be willing WILLIAM H. SEWARD should take possession of the army, the navy, and all the powers of the Government—I mean all the constitutional powers of the President of the United States? Would he allow WILLIAM H. SEWARD to take possession of these powers, or would he resist it even to the extent of going out of the Union?"

Sir, this question clearly implied that Mr. PRYOR would resist, even to the extent of going out of the Union, the inauguration of WILLIAM H. SEWARD. But that was early in the session. Gov. Wise, who, if Faulkner is to be relied upon, "sees far in advance of his contemporaries," had not then avowed his resolution to fight in the Union, and to stay in the Union. The "Enquirer," the family organ, which is engaged in warning the people of the South not to "precipitate disunion, but to prepare for it," has made the wonderful discovery that "the election of a Black Republican advocate of the 'irrepressible conflict' will be the withdrawal of the States *supporting such election* from the Union." As Gov. Wise has resolved to fight in the Union, and as his family organ has declared that the election of a Republican is a withdrawal of the States supporting his election from the Union, Mr. PRYOR will not now resist the inauguration of WILLIAM H. SEWARD, "to the extent of going out of the Union," but cling to this new "Virginia abstraction," and assume that the States voting for Mr. SEWARD are out of the Union.

Mr. CURRY, of Alabama, in a speech which is by far the most comprehensive and philosophical presentation of the issues yet made on the slavery side, in the House, said:

"However distasteful it may be to my friend from New York [Mr. CLARK], however much it may revolt the public sentiment or conscience of this country, I am not ashamed or afraid publicly to avow that the election of WILLIAM H. SEWARD or Salmon P. Chase, or any such representative of the Republican party, upon a sectional platform, ought to be resisted to the disruption of every tie that binds this Confederacy together. [Applause on the Democratic side of the House.]"

Mr. PUGH, of the same State, in a speech of much rhetorical beauty and eloquence, said:

"If, with the character of the Government well defined, and the rights and privileges of the parties to the compact clearly asserted by the Democratic party, the Black Republicans get possession of the Government, then the question is fully presented, whether the southern States will remain in the Union, as subject and degraded colonies, or will they withdraw and establish a southern Confederacy of coëqual homogeneous sovereigns?

"In my judgment, the latter is the only course compatible with the honor, equality, and safety of the South; and the sooner it is known and acted upon the better for all parties to the compact.

"The truest conservatism and wisest statesmanship demand a speedy termination of all association with such confederates, and the formation of another Union of States, homogeneous in population, institutions, interests, and pursuits."

Mr. MOORE, of the same State, said:

"I do not concur with the declaration made yesterday by the gentleman from Tennessee, that the election of a Black Republican to the Presidency was not cause for a dissolution of the Union. Whenever a President is elected by a fanatical majority at the North, those whom I represent, as I believe, and the gallant State which I in part represent, are ready, let the consequences be what they may, to fall back on their reserved rights, and say: 'As to this Union, we have no longer any lot or part in it.'"

Mr. BOYCE, of South Carolina, before the meeting of Congress, addressed his constituency in an elaborate and very carefully-prepared speech, in which he says that the election of a President by the Republican party "would constitute of itself a good reason why the South should refuse to submit to their rule." "Our policy is, first, to prevent, if possible, the election of a Republican President; second, if this must occur, in spite of all our wise exertions to the contrary, to cause it to occur under such issues as will best enable us to set up a southern Government." "The great point, then, is to ripen public opinion at the South for a dissolution of the Union in the contingency referred to—the election of a Republican President." He avows that "it is the fixed policy of this State to secede as soon as the Republican party elect their President." "If we desire to ripen public opinion among ourselves for southern independence, in the event of the election of a Republican President, we must exercise the policy of moderation in our movements preliminary to that result. We must use the most consummate prudence now, that we may be able to profit by the most desperate boldness then."

Mr. BONHAM, of the same State, said, on the floor of the House:

"As to disunion, upon the election of a Black Republican, I can speak for no one but myself and those I have here the honor to represent; and I say, without hesitation, that, upon the election of Mr. SEWARD, or any other man who indorses and proclaims the doctrines held by him and his party—call him by what name you please—I am in favor of an immediate dissolution of the Union. And, sir, I think I speak the sentiments of my own constituents and the State of South Carolina, when I say so."

Mr. CRAWFORD, of Georgia, as a quotation from his speech will show, spoke not only for himself, but for his associates from that State, and his disunion sentiments received the applause of his Democratic friends:

"Now, in regard to the election of a Black Republican President, I have this to say, and I speak the sentiment of every Democrat on this floor from the State of Georgia: we will never submit to the inauguration of a Black Republican President. [Applause from the Democratic benches, and hisses from the Republicans.] I repeat it, sir—and I have authority to say so—that no Democratic Representative

THE BUFFALO HISTORY MUSEUM

from Georgia on this floor will ever submit to the inauguration of a Black Republican President. [Renewed applause and hisses.] . . . The most confiding of them all are, sir, for 'equality in the Union or independence out of it;' having lost all hope in the former, I am for 'INDEPENDENCE NOW AND INDEPENDENCE FOR EVER!'"

Mr. GARTRELL, also of Georgia, has supported the position assumed by Mr. Crawford. He declares:

"Just so sure as the Republican party succeeds in electing a sectional man, upon their sectional, anti-slavery platform, breathing destruction and death to the rights of my people, just so sure, in my judgment, the time will have come when the South must and will take an unmistakable and decided action, and that then, 'he who dallies is a dastard, and he who doubts is damned.' I need not tell what I, as a southern man, will do—I think I may safely speak for the masses of the people of Georgia—that when that event happens, they, in my judgment, will consider it an overt act, a declaration of war, and meet immediately in convention, to take into consideration the mode and measure of redress. That is my position; and if that be treason to the Government, make the most of it."

Governor McRAE, of Mississippi, declared that he was not willing to submit to the election of a Republican President upon a Republican platform:

"I said to my constituents, and to the people at the capital of my State, on my way here, that if such an event did occur, while it would be their duty to determine the course which the State would pursue, it would be my privilege to counsel with them as to what I believed to be the proper course; and I said to them, what I say now, and will always say in such an event, that my counsel would be to take independence out of the Union in preference to the loss of constitutional rights, and consequent degradation and dishonor in it. That is my position, and it is the position which I know the Democratic party of the State of Mississippi will maintain."

Mr. DE JARNETTE, of Virginia, will resist the inauguration of the candidate of the Republican party, if that candidate is Mr. Seward, for he says:

"Thus WILLIAM H. SEWARD stands before the country a perjured traitor; and yet that man, with hands stained with the blood of our citizens, we are asked to elect President of the United States. You may elect him President of the North, but of the South never. Whatever the event may be, others may differ; but Virginia, in view of her ancient renown, in view of her illustrious dead, and in view of her *sic semper tyrannis*, will resist his authority. I have done."

Mr. LEAKE, unlike his colleague, Mr. Pryor, will not follow the lead of the late Governor Wise, and fight inside the Union. Mr. Leake evidently does not see so far in advance as does that noble son of Virginia. He says:

"I repudiate the sentiment which the gentleman ascribes to the late governor of Virginia. I choose rather to refer to the representatives of that State to hear her sentiments, than to any other source. It never entered my head, and I undertake to say that it never entered the brain of any representative of Virginia on this floor, to fight inside of this Union. The idea is ridiculous in the extreme. It is the *reductio ad absurdum*."

And Mr. LEAKE emphatically declares that

"Virginia has the right, when she pleases, to withdraw from the Confederacy [Applause from the Democratic benches.] . . . That is her doctrine. We will not fight in the Union, but quit it the instant we think proper to do so."

Mr. SINGLETON, of Mississippi, openly avows, on the floor of the House, that "their determination is fixed and unalterable; that they will have an expansion of slave territory in the Union if you will allow it, or outside of the Union if they must;" and that sentiment was received with Democratic applause. He goes on to say:

"The question now is, if we sever the connection which binds us and the North together, how are we to preserve the institution of slavery? There is but one mode by which, in my humble judgment, it can be perpetuated for any considerable number of years. . . . That mode is by expansion, and that expansion must be in the direction of Mexico. . . . There is in Mexico a large extent of territory that is suited to the cultivation of cotton, sugar, and rice. In my opinion, we must, and we are compelled, to expand in that direction, and thus perpetuate it—a hundred or a thousand years it may be." . . .

"It may be asked, when will the time come when we shall separate from the North? I say candidly, if the views expressed by the gentleman from Iowa are, as he says, common to the Republican party, and if they are determined to enforce those views, I declare myself ready to-day. I would not ask to delay the time a single hour." . . .

"You ask me when will the time come; when will the South be united? It will be when you elect a Black Republican—HALE, SEWARD, or Chase—President of the United States. Whenever you undertake to place such a man to preside over the destinies of the South, you may expect to see us undivided and indivisible friends, and to see all parties of the South arrayed to resist his inauguration." . . .

"We can never quietly stand by and permit the control of the army and navy to go into the hands of a Black Republican President."

Union sentiments, whenever, or by whomsoever uttered, grate harshly on Democratic ears, tuned to the accents of disunion. When Mr. STOKES, of Tennessee, the other day rebuked the disloyal sentiments which so glibly fell from Democratic lips—when he, in eloquent, manly, and patriotic language declared his devotion to the Union—when he quoted and indorsed as his own the words of Henry Clay, "that he would consent to the dissolution of the Union—never! never! never!" the Democracy foamed and gnashed its teeth in impotent wrath.

Governor LETCHER, of Virginia, in his recent message to the Legislature of his State, avows the rankest disunion and revolutionary sentiments. In this document, he declares that if a Republican President is elected in 1860,

"It is useless to attempt to conceal the fact that, in the present temper of the southern people, *it cannot be and will not be submitted to*. The 'irrepressible-conflict' doctrine, announced and advocated by the ablest and most distinguished leader of the Republican party, is an open declaration of war against the institution of African slavery, wherever it exists; and I would be disloyal to Virginia and the South if I did not declare that the election of such a man, entertaining such sentiments, and advocating such doctrines, *ought to be resisted by the slaveholding States*. The idea of permitting such a man to have the control and direction of the army and navy of the United States, and the appointment of high judicial and executive officers, postmasters included, *cannot be entertained by the South for a moment*."

I might quote, Mr. President, the avowals of disunion sentiments by other Democratic leaders and other Democratic presses; for these avowals of disloyalty to the unity of the Republic are scattered, in rank luxuriance, broadcast over the land. But I must pause.

Mr. CLAY. Will the senator pardon me a moment? He seems to charge the sentiments, which he calls disunion sentiments, on the Democratic party mainly. So far as the State of Alabama is involved in that charge, I may speak advisedly, when I say that sentiments such as I uttered, and which he has quoted, have been indorsed unanimously by the Legislature of the State which I have the honor to represent. And if the senator will pardon me further, I will say, too, that those who call themselves Americans or Oppositionists there, I think, have gone even further

THE BUFFALO HISTORY MUSEUM

than the Democratic party. Hence, I hardly think it is just to the American party in the South to attribute these sentiments exclusively to the Democratic party. I think the other side are entitled to a share of the credit of them.

Mr. WILSON. It may be so in the gentleman's own State; I know that on the Gulf they are running wild with disunion; but how is it with the representatives of the southern Opposition on the floor of the House of Representatives? Their sentiments have been pronounced, nearly all of them, distinctly in favor of the Union.

I have, however, gathered up enough of these noisy menaces of disunion, which are falling thick and fast around us, to show to the Senate and the country that the accepted leaders of the Democratic party are secessionists and disunionists, with the accents of disunion perpetually on their lips, and its spirit burning in their hearts. I have also gathered up, from the mass of facts which lie at my feet, enough to show that the Democratic party is *tainted* with the odor of disunion, that the *stain* of disloyalty is now indelibly stamped upon its brow. I have shown, too, that these menaces of disunion, which Democratic leaders are hurling around us in this Capitol, go unrebuked by the northern Democracy, whose glory it is to follow these apostles of secession and disunion. The country will not fail to see, and to mark, too, the discreditable fact, that while Democratic leaders in these chambers are muttering angry menaces of disunion, and while such madness goes unrebuked, even by the faintest whispers of the Democratic representatives of the loyal North and West, the Democratic presses in the North and West are busy—not in raining upon the heads of Democratic disunionists the withering rebukes of patriotism—but in the work of misrepresenting and maligning those who cling to the Union with unswerving fidelity alike in victory and in defeat. The country, too, will not fail to see that the Democratic orators dare not, even at a safe distance, utter the softest censure against the disloyalty of leaders they follow as the bondman follows his master, but they are appealing to the selfish fears of men to disown their manhood, and, by acts of humiliation, appease the awakened wrath of the Democratic chieftains now menacing the integrity of the Union.

Mr. President, the American Democracy, led by slave perpetuists and propagandists, secessionists and disunionists, now in the light of this age, stands before the nation the enemy of human progress, and in favor of the conservation and propagation of old abuses. No longer does the Democracy utter the accents of popular rights. No longer does the Democracy sympathize with man, at home or abroad, struggling for the recovery of lost rights or the enlargement of existing privileges. Does the Legislature of Kansas pass an act for the abolition of slavery there? Democracy resists it, and arrests it by Executive action. Does the Legislature of Nebraska, left "perfectly free to form their own domestic institutions in their own way," pass a bill to wipe from that vast Territory the pollution of slavery? Democracy resists it, defeats it by the Executive veto, and applauds that veto. Does the Legislature of New Mexico enact a bloody slave code? Democracy prompts it, praises it, applauds it. Does a sovereign Commonwealth lighten by humane legislation the burdens of a proscribed race, so that it may rise into the sunlight of a broader and higher manhood? Democracy is outraged, shocked, and it avenges itself by gibbering taunts, gibes, and jeers. Does a slave State enact or propose to enact statutes to still more oppress those already bending under the iron heel of oppression, or to check the action of its own citizens who may be prompted by sentiments of benevolence or a sense of justice to lessen the bitterness of bondage or give freedom to their own bondmen? Democracy approves and applauds it. Does Walker at the head of a lawless band of filibusters decree slavery in Central America? Democracy hails and applauds that decree. Does any indication point to the possible abolition of slavery in Cuba? Democracy protests, cannot permit it, will pay $200,000,000 for that slaveholding isle, but will not accept the "Gem of the Antilles," if burdened with freedom. Does England strike the fetters from the limbs of eight hundred thousand West India bondmen? Democracy deplores it, disapproves it, and persists in misrepresenting the effects of that great act of justice and humanity.

Does the Emperor of Russia propose a plan for the emancipation of millions, not of the African race, but of white men? Democracy shakes its head, shrugs its shoulders, utters no note of joy, sends no word of encouragement or greeting to the enlightened monarch who would enlarge the rights and elevate the condition of men. Does the Republican party, imbued with the sentiments of the Republican fathers, propose to arrest the expansion of slavery over the Territories of the Republic, and save those Territories to free labor, check the reopening slave traffic, and put the National Government in harmony with a progressive Christian civilization? Democracy, smitten with the consciousness of its waning power, raises the startling cry of disunion. To its abandonment of the sentiments, opinions, and policy, of the Republican fathers; to its betrayal of the rights and interests of free labor and the cause of human rights at home and abroad, is now added disloyalty to the integrity of the Union. Let the intelligent patriotism of the nation rebuke this mad exhibition of folly and fanaticism which would shiver this Union into broken fragments, and let it proclaim, in the words of Andrew Jackson, "The Federal Union must be preserved."

THE BUFFALO HISTORY MUSEUM

THE NEW YORK TRIBUNE.

Prepare for the Great Political Campaign of 1860.

INDUCEMENTS TO CLUBS.

NOW IS THE TIME TO SUBSCRIBE.

THE TRIBUNE—now more than eighteen years old, and having over a quarter of a million subscribers, or constant purchasers, diffused through every State and Territory of our Union—will continue in essence what it has been—the earnest champion of Liberty, Progress, and of whatever will conduce to our national growth in Virtue, Industry, Knowledge, and Prosperity.

THE NEW YORK DAILY TRIBUNE

is printed on a large imperial sheet, and published every morning and evening (Sundays excepted). It contains editorials on the topics of the times, employing a large corps of the best newspaper-writers of the day; Domestic and Foreign Correspondence; Proceedings of Congress; Reports of Lectures; City News; Cattle, Horse, and Produce Markets; Reviews of Books; Literary Intelligence; Papers on Mechanics and the Arts, Cookery, etc. etc. We strive to make THE TRIBUNE a *newspaper* to meet the wants of the public—its Telegraphic news alone costing over $15,000 per annum.

TERMS.

THE DAILY TRIBUNE is mailed to subscribers at $6 00 per annum, in advance; $3 00 for six months.

THE NEW YORK SEMI-WEEKLY TRIBUNE

is published every TUESDAY and FRIDAY, and contains all the editorials of the Daily, with the Cattle, Horse and General Markets reliably reported expressly for THE TRIBUNE; Notices of New Inventions, Foreign and Domestic Correspondence, Articles on Cookery; and during the sessions of Congress, it contains a summary of Congressional doings, with the more important speeches. We shall, as heretofore, make THE SEMI-WEEKLY TRIBUNE a Literary as well as a political newspapor, and we are determined that it shall remain in the front rank of family papers.

TERMS.

One Copy, one year, ...	$3 00	Five Copies, one year,.....	$11 25
Two Copies, one year, ...	5 00	Ten Copies, *to one address*,.....	20 00

Any person sending us a club of twenty or over, will be entitled to an extra copy. For a club of forty, we will send THE DAILY TRIBUNE one year.

THE NEW YORK WEEKLY TRIBUNE,

a large eight-page paper for the country, is published every SATURDAY, and contains Editorials on the important topics of the times, the news of the week, interesting correspondence from all parts of the world, the New York Cattle, Horse, and Produce Markets, interesting and reliable Political, Mechanical, and Agricultural Articles, Papers on Cookery, etc. etc.

We shall during this year, as hitherto, constantly labor to improve the quality of the instructive entertainment afforded by THE WEEKLY TRIBUNE, which we intend shall continue to be the best Family Weekly Newspaper published in the World. We consider the Cattle Market Reports alone richly worth to cattle raisers a year's subscription price.

TERMS.

One Copy, one year, ...	$2	Ten Copies, one year, ...	$12
Three Copies, one year, ...	5	Twenty Copies, *to one address*,.....	20
Five Copies, one year,.....	8	Twenty Copies, *to address of each subscriber*,	24

Any person sending us a club of Twenty, or more, will be entitled to an extra copy. For a club of Forty, we will send the SEMI-WEEKLY TRIBUNE; for a club of One Hundred, THE DAILY TRIBUNE will be sent gratis.

Subscriptions may commence at any time. Terms always cash in advance. All letters to be addressed to

HORACE GREELEY & CO., TRIBUNE BUILDINGS,
Nassau Street, New York.

THE BUFFALO HISTORY MUSEUM